DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 925 JC 810 628

AUTHOR Kirby, Emily B.
TITLE Program Evaluation at Hudson Valley Community College, 1980-81.
INSTITUTION Hudson Valley Community Coll., Troy, N.Y.
PUB DATE 1 Sep 81
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Curriculum; Community Colleges; Curriculum Evaluation; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Program Evaluation; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

The Program Evaluation Process described in this report was initiated at Hudson Valley Community College (HVCC) in spring 1981. Section I of the report presents the philosophy supporting the evaluation process which emphasizes program quality, cost effectiveness, and assistance with program improvement. Section II outlines the Program Evaluation Process itself, which involves a three-year cycle in which programs are reviewed the first year and re-reviewed two years later. This section also lists the HVCC programs involved in the process and presents a timeline for the completion of the review. The section goes on to describe the functioning of the review team, which may pass a program, give it probationary status, or determine that it should be phased out. Next this section reviews team membership, which includes permanent members from the finance office, academic affairs, president's office, and student affairs; rotating members who are usually deans or department chairs from divisions not being reviewed; and program representatives. Section II concludes with a list of types of data needed for review (i.e., program costs, success, and variability; predictions; and supporting material). Section III presents preliminary outcomes of the use of this process in evaluating 16 programs, of which nine were accorded a pass, six were not rated due to insufficient data, and one was placed on probation. Section IV summarizes the steps in the process and assesses effects on HVCC. Appendices include summarized reports and sample forms. (KL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208925

PROGRAM EVALUATION AT

HUDSON VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

1980-81

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Emily B. Kirby

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Emily B. Kirby
September 1, 1981

JC 810 628

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Introduction

Monitoring of the academic program has become an integral part of postsecondary educational administration. While few would question the necessity for a program evaluation procedure, many misunderstand it. This paper outlines the Program Evaluation Process instituted at Hudson Valley Community College in the spring of 1981. It is hoped that this effort will clarify the issues and objectives of program evaluation and thereby lead to its more effective use as an educational tool.

I. Philosophy

Program Evaluation at Hudson Valley Community College began with two basic assumptions:

1. That most HVCC programs are of high quality, and
2. That program evaluation assists in program improvement.

As a corollary, it was assumed that each program could utilize the evaluation opportunity as an impetus for that self-examination so vital to the achievement of academic excellence. Our philosophy of program evaluation thus was wholly positive.

We were not unduly naive as we focused upon the realities of educational life in the 1980's. We realized that evaluation is an invaluable aspect of planning and can be of assistance both in providing community service and in increasing program flexibility.

The main question asked was: Are HVCC's programs viable, needed, necessary? To arrive at useful answers meant we had to evaluate each program on the issues of cost efficiency and benefits. Thus, schoolwide criteria for evaluating program cost efficiency had to be identified, as well as schoolwide and program-specific criteria for benefits evaluation.

We assumed that ninety percent of our programs are of high quality, are cost-efficient, and produce the benefits expected of them. However, these programs periodically need a checkup to ensure continued good health, as well as to provide a base line for future evaluations. We further assume that the remaining ten percent of our programs require continuing close attention and perhaps shifts in major focus or replacement by more viable, needed, necessary programs. Thus, program evaluation is intimately linked to the community college's philosophical assumption of responsiveness to community need.

II. The Program Evaluation Process

A. General Outline of the Process

The Program Evaluation Process is organized so that each program will be on a three-year evaluation cycle: initial review will take place in year one and re-review to determine degree of implementation of suggestions, improvement, other needed changes, and general trends will occur in year three. Henceforth, any new programs will enter the cycle at the completion of their third year. Thus, in any academic year roughly one-third of the programs will not be under review, one-third will be entering the review process, and the remaining third will be completing a review cycle. The first collegewide cycle will be completed at the end of academic year 1983. At that time, each program will have base-line review data available, while the first group of programs reviewed -- the 1980-81 group -- will be examining its progress in the interval.

Since this is only the second year of the program evaluation process, some review schedule modifications may prove desirable after the completion of 1983's reviews. Of course, it is much too early to make conjectures on that point. However, the process itself has been institutionalized as a component of the Master Plan. In short, the college has accepted responsibility for performing program evaluation on a regular basis -- even if the intervals involved change somewhat:

for instance the three-year interval might be supplanted by one of five year's duration with a less formal midpoint review conducted and submitted by the department to a committee constituted for that purpose. The suggestion is made because program evaluation, if performed with the thoroughness it deserves, is a valuable, though costly and time consuming, activity.

B. Three Phases

During the initial collegewide program evaluation year, eighteen programs entered the process. Of these sixteen completed the first phase and two will have initial review in fall 1981. The programs involved in spring 1981 were:

Air Conditioning Engineering Technology
Automotive Technology
Chemical Engineering Technology
Environmental Engineering Technology
Indudtrial Technology (Drafting Option)
Chemistry
Engineering Science
Medical Laboratory Technology
Industrial Technology (Management Option)
Automotive Mechanics
Respiratory Therapy
Legal Secretarial Science
Medical Secretarial Science
Transportation and Distribution Management
Mechanical Engineering Technology
Physics

The last two -- Physical Education and Early Childhood -- enter the process during September 1981. The chart shown on page 3a (Priorities for Program Evaluation) provides a timetable for HVCC program review.

C. The Review Team - Function and Composition

Each program review is conducted by a review team whose recommendations trigger the next phase for each program review. The review team makes one of the following recommendations following the initial review session:

Pass - no further action.

Probationary - directives, guidelines for action, time line to final review

Planned Phase-out - directives, guidelines for redeployment of staff and resources.

PRIORITIES FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION

DIVISION	1981	1982	1983	TOTAL PROGRAMS
Liberal Arts and Sciences	Physical Education (F)	English (S) Humanities (S) Social Sciences (S)		4
Engineering and Industrial Technologies	Air Conditioning Technology Automotive Technology Automotive Mechanics Chemical Technology Environmental Technology Industrial Technology-Drafting Industrial Technology-Management Mechanical Technology	Electrical Technology Refrigeration Mechanics Machining Processes Electrical Construction and Maintenance	Construction Technology Civil Technology	14
Community Services	Early Childhood (F)	Criminal Justice (S) Human Services (F)	Individual Studies (S)	4
Health and Physical Sciences	Chemistry Engineering Science Medical Laboratory Technology Physics Respiratory Therapy	Biology Dental Assisting Nursing Physician's Assistant Radiologic Technology	Dental Hygiene Mathematics Mathematics and Science Mortuary Science	14
Business	Legal Secretarial Science Medical Secretarial Science Transportation and Distribution Management	Banking, Insurance and Real Estate Executive Secretarial Science Business Administration	Accounting Data Processing Marketing	9
TOTALS	18	17	10	45

(F) = Fall
(S) = Spring

A final review team report is sent to the department chair and dean; this report, with comments of the department chair and dean, is sent to the president. The president recommends the action to be taken.

The program review process, as outlined, involves a review team having three types of participants:

Permanent members - from finance, academics, president's office, student affairs;

Rotating members - dean and department chair from a division other than of program being reviewed;

Program representatives - dean and department chair.

As can be seen, all segments of the college community are represented in the review process. Each program under review thus is focused upon by the college's academic and administrative structure. Each program is thus reviewed simultaneously from different persepctives. Such issues as: how is the program functioning? and how does the program function in the context of the college as a whole? are examined. College priorities and deployment of resources enter each program review; initial recommendations are made, based upon the review team discussion, which, in turn, relies upon the breadth, depth, and accuracy of the data submitted in behalf of the program undergoing review and the review criteria formulated.

D. Data Presented

In this initial cycle of program evaluations, supportive data available in campus files furnished the major data source. Some programs provided optional documents, additional survey data, or testimonial letters. Programs submitted the following kinds of data to the review team ten days prior to the review session:

Data	Available From	Data Topic
Program Costs	Fiscal Officer	total program cost; cost allocations
Program Outcomes	Office of Student Development	*graduation, placement, transfer of students
Program Inputs	Registrar's Office	*enrollment figures
Program Status	Admissions Office	*application
Program Documents	Department Office	data for two previous years

*current year and past-year data

During the review session, the data presented is examined in detail and discussed for the purpose of assigning a review recommendation. In instances where data accuracy or completeness is questioned, making program evaluation difficult, data resubmission is indicated and a "conditional" review rating results. This means program re-review in the following semester when the data file is complete. Most programs proceed smoothly to the next phase, having satisfied the review criteria.

E. Review Criteria

All programs are evaluated according to the same set of criteria. The following are included:

Criteria	Measurement
Program costs	Cost/student Cost/faculty member
Program success	Percent placement/transfer
Program variability	Percent change in enrollment/graduation
Program Prediction	Percant change in applications over two years
Internal Program Materials	e.g., grant support, articles about program, unfulfilled demand for graduates, advanced degrees and/or occupational promotions achieved, geographic uniqueness of program, cyclic nature of program

III. Preliminary Outcomes

Phase one data on the sixteen programs examined in spring 1981 best illustrate the program review process. The review team recommended that nine programs be accorded "pass":

Chemical Engineering Technology
Chemistry
Medical Laboratory Technology
Industrial Technology (Management Option)
Automotive Mechanics
Respiratory Therapy
Transportation and Distribution Management
Mechanical Engineering Technology
Physics

These programs will receive final review team reports during fall 1981. They will be reviewed again (according to the present schedule) in academic 1984.

Six additional programs received a "conditional" rating. As can be seen, in each case the financial data was insufficient, was felt to be inaccurate or inconclusive, or was unacceptable for some other reason. These programs and the reason for the "conditional" rating were:

Program	Reason
Air Conditioning Engineering Technology	Student/faculty costs
Automotive Technology	Student/faculty costs
Industrial Technology (Drafting Option)	Student costs
Legal Secretarial Science	Student costs
Medical Secretarial Science	Student costs
Engineering Science	Student costs

Where such disagreements occurred, the chief fiscal officer and the department chair were requested to meet to achieve consensus about the cost figures so that the review process could be completed during the fall 1981 semester.

One program, Environmental Science, was placed on "probationary" status. The reason for this recommendation was low student enrollment in fall 1981.

Capsule comments from each of the program reviews may be found in the appendix, along with blank copies of the forms used in the evaluation process. A binder containing all the materials used by and generated during the program evaluation process may be inspected in the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

IV. Additional Pertinent Information

The program review process, itself, is periodically reviewed to insure that it remains maximally useful and optimally responsive. In addition to the response to the program review process rating sheet filled out by each department chair immediately after the review session, five other considerations are part of the process.

1. There will be an annual assessment of the program review process by the Vice Presidents for Planning and Public Service and the Senior Vice President on programs reviewed during the year to determine relevance to institutional mission and whether planned outcomes are being met.
2. The program review process will also be monitored to assure that it provides for participatory decision making involving the implementers of each program reviewed.
3. Periodic review process checks will be made to insure maintenance of flexibility, modifiability and responsiveness as needs emerge.
4. The review process will be examined to determine how well it functions as a vehicle for strengthening programs by providing guidance and support to each program reviewed.

5. Finally, continuous monitoring by all involved in the program review process assure its relevance to overall college procedures, planning, and budget processes, and reinforcement of HVCC's mission.

These five steps monitoring the program review process serve as checks and balances. They should help to prevent serious errors in program evaluation while providing means for the entire college community to participate in the program review process as needs to do so arise.

Summary:

The Program Review Process initially had some reluctance to overcome. At first those involved in programs scheduled for review the first year felt threatened by the prospect of evaluation, which they interpreted as wholly negative, productive of negative consequences for themselves and their program. When the program review process emerged as a positive, cooperative venture, the negative attitudes toward it diminished. The opportunity to have a multifaceted focus -- finance, academic, student affairs, president's office, dean, and department chair colleague -- upon each program under review was appreciated; once recognized by each program, the diverse perspectives represented tended to produce new insights of value to the program under review. In addition, the communal/collegial aspects of the college were enhanced by participation in the program review process through increased awareness of, knowledge of, understanding of each of the programs.

Each department chair presented his/her program's status and, in so doing, had an opportunity to exercise management and leadership skills. Meanwhile, the department chair colleague at the program review had a chance to exercise objectivity, critical thinking, and judgmental talents; the pertinent perspectives here related to how the program under review was functioning and how it fit into the total academic program. Thus, human resource development was a serendipitous outcome of the process.

But perhaps the most important outcome was the openness of the whole process which provided an atmosphere of trust and goodwill in which the program evaluation could be conducted. We hope to continue this important work in the same spirit.

9/1/81 Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs

Appendices: A. Capsule reports from programs evaluated 1980-81

B. Sample forms used in HVCC Program Evaluation Process

APPENDIX A

Program Review Reports 1980-81

Air Conditioning Engineering Technology

(Conditional)

Supporting documents presented included cost analysis data from the financial officer, placement data from the acting department chair, and enrollment statistics from the student affairs office.

The conditional rating was based upon quesicn about the calculation of student and faculty costs, upon the need to recalculate $84,616.60 of direct contractual and equipment costs, and upon the apparently incorrect eight-hour elective in the senior year.

The review team made the following suggestions:

1. That the name of the curriculum be changed to reflect its content more accurately;
2. That the degree granted become A.O.S. rather than remain A.A.S., again more accurately reflecting program content;
3. That One + One programs with other colleges be explored;
4. That mathematics and physics be dropped as requirements; and
5. That per faculty cost figures for each course be calculated.

Questions were raised about the high attrition in technical math and physics. It was noted that the curriculum had changed within the past year; it used to be part of Mechanical Engineering Technology. Enrollments were felt to be low.

The five suggestions made during the review (4/21/81) were addressed by the department chair (5/1) and will be discussed by the review team.

Program re-review will take place during fall 1981.

Industrial Technology (Drafting)

(Conditional)

Cost figures, enrollment, placement data, and a department-produced data sheet including faculty, costs, placement, and applications were submitted. Cost per student figures diverged. The review team's comment was "need more on costs." The department chair and financial officer will furnish this information.

The review team also requested more qualitative information but noted that the entry process into the program was innovative, involving both day and night students. While attrition is high, the outlook for students and graduates is bright; graduates are accepted in industry. More women are entering the program.

Program re-review is scheduled for fall 1981.

Environmental Engineering Technology

(Probationary)

Data presented included cost analysis, placement, a retention study, and current enrollment statistics. The cost data requires revision by the financial officer and department chair.

The review team recommended that freshman courses be discontinued unless the enrollment figures reached twenty by May 1, 1981.

The program is scheduled for re-review by January 1, 1982.

Chemical Engineering Technology

(Pass)

Data furnished included cost, enrollment, placement figures from the college offices, and departmental figures containing cost, enrollment, placement, transfer, enrollees who graduate, enrollment and application changes, and space filled. It was noted that all courses taken by Chemical Engineering Technology students are service courses, but that the financial officer should allocate costs for the dean (part-time for this program) and the department chair. Department and financial office cost figures varied. The cost per student figure agreed upon for this program review was $6,190.00.

The review team felt that entering and graduating classes are too small and that emphasis should be placed upon increasing these numbers.

Next program review is scheduled for 1984.

Automotive Technology

(Conditional)

Supporting documents furnished included 1) cost breakdown, 2) placement data, 3) applications data, 4) qualitative data.

The "conditional" rating was based upon the need for additional data. Specifically, the percent of contractual and equipment cost allocated to Automotive Technology and Automotive Mechanics was questioned. Figures on cost per student, therefore, need recalculation, as do the cost allocations for purchase of equipment. Department chair and financial officer will cooperate on producing accurate figures.

Placement figures were felt to be low (64.3% 7/9) for graduates. Applications for fall 1981, however, were up (40 as compared to 30). Some attrition problems due to math and physics were noted. The need for more data on non-matriculated students was brought out. Positive responses to the program from Texaco and others were mentioned.

The review team suggested more sophisticated audiovisual recruitment techniques and more exposure for the program. Qualitative data funished dealt with the history of the program, the need to rebuild the program, the intradepartmental emphasis on course outlines and recruiting.

Program re-review is scheduled for fall 1981.

Chemistry

(Pass)

A comprehensive data report was furnished by the department chair. Cost, enrollment, and placement data were provided by the campus offices. The cost per student figure of $123 per credit was agreed upon.

The review team recommended more vigorous recruitment from the major areas chemistry is now serving. It was suggested that the department chair maintain active interest in population shifts and in deployment of staff.

Program is scheduled for re-review in 1984.

Engineering Science

(Conditional)

Data was furnished on costs, enrollments, placement by campus offices.

Conditional rating was related to questions regarding student costs. Department chair and financial officer will generate accurate figures.

The 60% attrition rate, highest of any program, was related to the number of foreign students in the program and to course difficulty. It was noted that transfer attrition is minimal. It was also noted that graduates of this program tend to move from the area.

Review team comments included a request for qualitative data inclusion, mention that this program requires more credits than most, a cost-related factor, and that costs would rise in the future. The team recommended that the department chair provide a statement on attrition within the program.

Re-review is scheduled for fall 1981.

Medical Laboratory Technology

(Pass)

Campus office data on costs, enrollment, placement were provided. Departmental cost analysis figures for 1979-80 were available. Department chair also submitted a comprehensive report, including student and graduate surveys.

Demographic Data: Qualitative data indicated that higher salaries in other areas pull graduates of this program out of Medical Laboratory Technology. Students of this program are tracked by the department. The program has applied for accreditation.

The department chair responded positively to the program review process, and gave suggestions for improvement of the process included computerizing data, definition of data submission format among other useful ideas.

Program scheduled for re-review in 1984.

Automotive Mechanics

(Pass)

Campus offices' data were submitted as was a comprehensive departmental report covering quantitative and qualitative information.

The review team suggested that computerized inventory control ideas (mentioned in the departmental report) could profitably be explored by other departments. The review team rated this idea an excellent concept.

Review of Automotive Mechanics is scheduled for 1984.

9/1/81

Industrial Technology (Management)

(Pass)

Campus office data on costs, enrollments, placements were submitted. It was noted that there had been significant decreases in all costs attributed to the program in the year end intervals between 1979 and 1980.

The qualitative information revealed that most students are night school, non-matriculated students. With registration changes of these students, there are always more graduates than students who began the program. There are no dropouts in this program. Students tend to be older than the HVCC average student. This is an outstanding program.

Program re-review is scheduled for 1984.

Transportation and Distribution Management

(Pass)

Campus offices submitted data on costs, enrollments, placement. In addition, the Business Division provided data for 1979-80 on income and expenses, plus a graduate survey for 1979 and 1980.

It was noted that some TDM majors enter as freshmen while others do so as seniors. Attrition was approximately one-third of the freshman class. New seniors enter in January.

The review team did not record any suggestions or recommendations.

Re-review of this program is scheduled for 1984.

Respiratory Therapy

(Pass)

Campus office data plus a voluminous departmental report was filed.

Qualitative data in support of this program emphasized its high standards, good student retention, students' State-level involvement, and faculty national involvement.

The review team gave the program an "A+" rating and praised the letters about it in a State publication.

(The department chair could benefit from review of FERPA regulations which strongly suggest that there are possible legal hazards to circulation of applicant names and social security numbers.)

The program is to be re-reviewed in 1984.

Legal Secretarial Science

(Conditional)

In addition to campus cost, enrollment, admissions, placement data, a comprehensive departmental data packet was submitted. The packet included cost/student computations, curricular changes, and a cover statement.

The "conditional" rating is related to divergence between the campus and department cost/student figures. The financial officer and department chair will meet to arrive at the correct cost per student. Problems with attrition by jobs and problems with costs (e.g., typewriting) were noted.

Department chair rated the program evaluation as "well organized and timed well."

Program re-review is scheduled for fall 1981.

Medical Secretarial Science

(Conditional)

Campus office cost, admissions, enrollment, placement data were furnished, so was a most comprehensive departmental packet covering the above, curricular changes, internship advisors, student survey responses of current seniors.

Divergence between financial office and departmental costs figures were the basis for the conditional rating. The financial officer and department chair will confer to arrive at correct figures. The review team comment was: "The program would receive "pass" determination; however, cost computations are being questioned." The review team recommended that the department chairperson receive revised cost data.

It was noted that Secretarial Science students select the option in Medical Secretarial Science as seniors. Thus, attrition occurs at the freshman (General) level not during the senior year. During the last semester, students have a cooperative (work) experience.

Program re-review is scheduled for fall 1981.

-o-

Mechanical Engineering Technology

(Pass)

Data submitted included campus office cost, enrollment, admissions, placement information, plus a departmental summary.

The review team commented that the following needed to be addressed:

1. the financial base of the cost of the program;
2. ratio of full to part-time teachers -- it was felt that program continuity and coordination would be well served by having more full-time faculty in this program;
3. optimum program size.

In addition, it was noted that campus office calculations produced high indirect costs. The program currently has more job placement offers than can be filled. The program needs more lab space, especially for physics.

Program re-review is scheduled for 1984.

9/1/81

Physics

(Pass)

In addition to campus office data, a report covering 1977-78 through 1980-81 was submitted. Materials submitted indicated that extra lab space for physics was anticipated in the new building, that hiring of one new faculty member in fall 1981 was anticipated, and that additional Engineering Science or Engineering Technology students could not be accommodated under current conditions.

The review team recommended that the department chair "keep track of productivity level" which "may peak or level (off) or decline."

Program re-review is scheduled for 1984.

APPENDIX B

Program Evaluation Forms

PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM

Name of program: _____

Chair: _____ Dean: _____

Date reviewed: _____

Supporting documents: (List)

Panel determination: _____pass

_____conditional

_____probationary

Panel comments:

Panel recommendations:

Panel signatures: _____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM

Name of program: _____

Chair: _____ Dean: _____

Date reviewed: _____

Supporting documents: (List)

Rater determination: _____ pass

_____ conditional

_____ probationary

Rater comments:

Rater recommendations:

Rater signatures: _____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

NAME OF PROGRAM: _____

NAME OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR: _____

DATE: _____

Please share your evaluation of the Program Review Process with us. Your comments will be used to improve the process.

1) Reactions:

2) Suggestions for improvement:

Thank you.

4/81

Review 1 Program	Cost/Student	Cost/Fac.	% Placed	% Transfer	% Grad.	1979-80 % Enroll. Change
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						
11.						
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						
16.						
17.						
18.						

Chart continued on next page

	1980-81 Change App.	1980 Space Avail.	Space Filled 5/81	Quantitative Reports Yes	Quantitative Reports No	Qualitative Reports Yes	Qualitative Reports No
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							
11.							
12.							
13.							
14.							
15.							
16.							
17.							
18.							